

Date: 11/29/2004

**Comments of Southern California Gas Co.
for Public Hearings on Cabrillo Port EIS/EIR
Monday, Nov. 29, 2004
Santa Clarita**

G060-1
Thank you for the information.

Good evening. My name is Tony Tartaglia. I am public affairs manager with Southern California Gas Company.

We have no position on the proposed Cabrillo Port LNG facility. Rather, we believe it is up to the local communities and appropriate regulatory agencies to decide if and where LNG facilities should be sited and what mitigation measures will be required for approved facilities.

However, gas from this or any other site that gets built in southern California will be fed into The Gas Company's natural gas pipeline system. I am here, speaking to you this evening, to respond to questions that have arisen about two issues: the need for this natural gas and the safety of our pipeline system.

First, let me address the need for additional supplies of natural gas.

Many of us in Southern California rely on natural gas. In fact, the percentage of homes, businesses and electric power plants fueled by natural gas is greater in Southern California than anywhere else in the nation.

The Gas Company delivers nearly 1 trillion cubic feet of natural gas annually. That is about 4 to 5 percent of all the natural gas delivered in the United States.

Unfortunately, over the last five years, the cost of natural gas has been increasing. At the same time, production has not kept up with demand. These are natural trends, and they are expected to continue. Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham has projected a 40 percent increase in natural gas demand over the next 20 years.

The Gas Company believes more supply sources are needed.

Our customers will reap the benefit with lower prices and increased reliability.

We also believe that customers' efforts to reduce demand and conserve energy continue to be very important. By reducing demand, we can reduce the need for additional gas supply sources, and The Gas Company is committed to continue to support demand reduction and energy efficiency programs. But, we don't believe this will be enough to offset the total need.

We favor adding a diverse set of supply sources to the system. Potential new supplies may come, for example, from the Rocky Mountains, but LNG – liquefied natural gas – is another new potential source.

G060-1

A study by Cambridge Energy Research Associates, a leading international consulting firm that specializes in energy issues, estimated that total savings in gas costs from bringing LNG into the west coast will be at least several hundred million dollars a year, and could be as much as a billion dollars a year.

That's a lot of money that our region could be spending on something other than higher gas costs.

I think that addresses the need for new natural gas supplies.

The other issue that has arisen involves pipeline safety.

Safety is The Gas Company's most important priority. We devote a lot of time and effort to ensure that we provide *safe* and reliable service.

Pipeline problems can be dangerous. And, there have been significant pipeline incidents in other parts of the country. I shudder when I read about these events. They scare me and probably everyone else in our business. That's why we pay so much attention to safety.

Here's some of what we do:

- First, all new facilities follow design and construction practices that include conservative design factors and rigid inspection and testing prior to being put into service.
- For existing pipelines, we regularly conduct leakage surveys and patrols to identify potential leaks or problems.
- Cathodic protection, a system designed to prevent steel pipes from deteriorating, has been installed on all our transmission pipelines.
- In addition, whenever we work on a line, we look for potential problems and analyze samples of the pipe. We also periodically analyze liquids that routinely enter the pipeline with the natural gas.
- Additionally, for the last several years, we have had a pipeline integrity program to evaluate the condition of our transmission pipelines. As part of this program, we assess potential risks, inspect pipelines and take needed corrective action, which may include repair or replacement of the pipeline. We currently are spending about \$35 million a year on this program.

All of these steps help us determine the condition of the pipe. When we recognize a *potential* problem, we take steps to prevent it from becoming an *actual* problem.

G060-1
cont'd

Of course, damage to our pipelines can be caused by people who hit a line while digging. That's why we have long supported and promoted Underground Service Alert. Call the 1-800 number, which is prominently listed in the phone book and on much of the information we distribute, at least 48 hours before work is expected to begin, and we will go out and mark where our pipelines are located. There should be no excuse for hitting one of our pipelines.

The California Public Utilities Commission regularly inspects our facilities and audits our activities. During the last 10 years, we have not been fined by the CPUC for any pipeline safety incidents. Also, during that same time period, we have not had any injuries to the public related to failure of our transmission pipeline system.

In fact, during the more than 130 years that we have been operating the natural gas delivery system throughout Southern California, there have been few incidents involving injuries.

We are proud of our safety record, and we will work hard to maintain not only our safety record, but the trust and confidence of our customers and the communities we serve.

Thank you very much.

With me today are experts on pipeline construction from our engineering group. We will be happy to answer any questions relevant to our pipeline system.

Nov. 24, 2004

G060-1
cont'd

Origin: E&E Website

Date: 12/19/2004

First Name: Gary

Last Name: Tauriello

Address: 6723 2nd Ave.

City: Los Angeles

State: CA

Zip Code: 90043

Topic: Aesthetics

Comments: I would like to comment on the topic of air quality because the quality of air over Los Angeles is disgusting. I think we need to do something to improve California's air quality. From what I understand natural gas is one of the most clean burning fuels available. I've heard a lot of people say that we should not be depending on natural gas from other countries. But I don't see any problem with it. It benefits both of the countries involved, and there is nothing wrong with that otherwise it is just selfish. I want to support the building of the LNG port. Thank you.

G233-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website

Date: 12/19/2004

First Name: Kathleen

Last Name: Tauriello

Address: 6723 2nd Ave.

City: Los Angeles

State: CA

Zip Code: 90043

Topic: Alternatives

Comments: I would like to see more use of energy efficient vehicles such as the hybrid cars. Without enough natural gas we wouldn't need to develop a dependence on these types of low polluting, energy efficient modes of transportation. I feel that a dependence on these types of vehicles would be a good thing. The more natural gas that is available the cheaper it will be able to be purchased. This will be a great alternative to the ridiculous prices of gasoline today.

G178-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

DEC. 13, 2004 9:26PM

308748

NO. 420 P. 1

USCG-2004-16877-682

**PLEASE HELP PROVIDE SAFE JOBS FOR
THE PEOPLE OF OXNARD AND VENTURA
COUNTY. I ATTENDED THE CROWDED
HEARING BUT WAS UNABLE TO STAY ANY
LONGER TO SPEAK. IT WAS AFTER 10:00PM
AND THE OTHER SPEAKERS WERE STILL
SPEAKING.**

G417-1

**PLEASE LIST ME AS A SUPPORTER OF THE
THIS PROJECT.**

G417-2

**TONY TEJADA
ANTHONY TEJADA
1411 BAYVIEW DRIVE - APARTMENT NO. 202
OXNARD, CA
93035**

DEPT. OF INVESTIGATION
OXNARD
2004 DEC 20 P 12:33

Docket No. USCG-2004-16877
State Clearinghouse No.
20044021107

Source:
USCG Docket

DN: 12/19/04

G417-1

The notices for the public meetings and the information provided at the public meetings indicated that commenters would speak in the order that their requests were received, after elected officials and representatives of government agencies were heard. We regret that you were unable to stay at the meeting to provide oral testimony; however, your submitted written comment carries the same weight as any oral comments provided at public hearings.

G417-2

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Comment Form—Cabrillo Port LNG Deepwater Port draft EIS/EIR

Name (Please Print): DOUG TEMPLE Source: Public Meeting - Oxnard PM
 Organization/Agency: _____ Date: 11/30/2004
 Street Address: 2677 BARNACLE COVE
 City: PORT HUENEME State: CA Zip Code: 93041
 Email address: _____

Please provide written comments in the space below and drop this form into the comment box.

You may also submit comments

- Electronically through the Project Web site at <http://www.cabrilloport.ene.com>
- Electronically through the Docket Management System Web site (docket number 16877) at <http://dms.dot.gov>.
- Or by mail or email to following addresses:

Docket Management Facility
 Room PL-401
 400 Seventh Street SW
 Washington, DC 20590-0001

California State Lands Commission
 100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South
 Sacramento, CA 95825
ogginsc@slc.ca.gov
 Attention: Cy Oggins

All comments must be received by 2 p.m. PST, December 20, 2004

Comments (Use other side or attach additional sheets if necessary): _____ **G075-1**

*I live in Port Hueneme near Diamond Beach and
 I don't want this pipeline going through my area.
 It does not have to go here and you will be
 destroying natural areas & wetlands by putting this
 here.*

No action will be taken until the environmental review process is completed.

G075-1

Section 4.8 discusses potential impacts on natural areas and wetlands.

Origin: E&E Website
 Date: 12/20/2004
 First Name: William
 Last Name: Terry
 Address: 250 E. Pleasant Valley Rd. #47
 City: Oxnard
 State: CA
 Phone No.: 805-488-0422
 Email: bterry@webtv.net
 Topic: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Cumulative Impacts Analysis, Environmental Justice, Socioeconomics, Water Quality and Sediments

Comments:

William L. Terry
 250 E. Pleasant Valley Rd. #47
 Oxnard, Ca.93033
 Email bterry@webtv.net

G327

1.2 Need for project:

There has been no unbiased study to determine the amount of gas available and the amount of gas needed. | 1

The available solar, wind and geothermal to generate electricity, which uses the bulk of natural gas, if these were to be perused with the same vigor, it would show that this project would not be needed. | 2

1.3 Public Involvement

Line 30-37; The NOI/NOP was sent by electronic mail to 94 persons and mailed via certified mail to 63 interested parties and was posted on the Federal Docket, the CSLC website, and a public website maintained by the Lead Agencies' EIS/EIR consultant for interested parties to download a copy. Nine hundred postcards announcing the scoping meetings and open houses were mailed to landowners along the proposed and alternative routes for the pipeline. Notices for scoping meetings were placed in Malibu Surfside News, the Signal (Santa Clarita) the Malibu Times, and the Ventura County Star.

The public was not adequately involved because of lack of proper notices for a project of this magnitude. This project will affect over 500,000 people environmentally, millions of persons economically. | 3

4.17 Environmental Justice

This is too narrowly defined, it should cover of the project will impact the community's total environment. The culmination of Health-Risking Particulates from Ship, cargo, truck and train operations at the Port of Hueneme, the processing of thousands of new cars many cold starts each day add to the poor air quality in our area this project will add to that. | 4

Some weather patterns bring air pollutions from the Los Angeles basin into our area.

Environmental Justice should not only apply to the in use of the Gas but the point of origin.

There is a shortage of housing for low and very low income, some Motels and camp grounds for housing, this would add to the problem. Where would the Tents be placed? | 5

There should be a list of core samples and results, throughout the project area for toxic pesticides (ie. DDT) and documentation that there are no Cultural Resources disturbed. | 6

There should be a condition that all materials, steel, pipe, structures and ships be built and operated by U.S. Companies and Personnel | 7

If granted the permit should not extend beyond the life of the FSRU and the decommissioning should be included in this EIS/EIR | 8

G327-1

Sections 1.2.2 and 1.2.3 contain updated information on natural gas needs in the U.S. and California. Forecast information has been obtained from the U.S. Department of Energy's Energy Information Agency and from the California Energy Commission.

G327-2

Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 address conservation and renewable energy sources, within the context of the California Energy Commission's 2005 Integrated Energy Report and other State and Federal energy reports, as alternatives to replace additional supplies of natural gas.

G327-3

Section 1.5 contains information on the public review and comment opportunities provided by the lead agencies in full conformance with the provisions of the law. Both the CSLC and MARAD/USCG have met or exceeded the public notice requirements for this Project (see Sections 1.5.1 and 1.5.3).

G327-4

Section 4.6 contains an expanded analysis of air quality impacts. Section 4.20.3.6 discusses cumulative air quality impacts. Section 1.3 addresses environmental considerations at the overseas source of the Project's natural gas.

G327-5

Section 4.16.1.2 contains information on the projected work force and housing.

G327-6

Section 4.12.1 describes the known hazardous wastes along the offshore and onshore routes. Section 4.12.4 describes the actions that would be taken if contaminated soils or sediments are encountered. Section 4.18.1 contains the results of the sediment sampling at the proposed HDB exit point.

G327-7

Subsequent to the completion of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR, the Applicant completed pedestrian cultural resources surveys. Section 4.9.1 contains information on the results of these surveys. Section 4.9.4 contains information about cultural resources impacts and mitigation.

G327-8

Neither the State of California nor the Federal government can dictate to an Applicant where it acquires its supplies or ships.

Sections 4.2.7.3 and 4.3.1.5 contain information on the qualifications for crews.

G327-9

The projected FSRU in-service life is a maximum of 40 years. Environmental conditions and specific impacts 40 years from now are not reasonably foreseeable. As noted in Section 2.8, supplemental NEPA/CEQA documentation, which would take into consideration the environmental conditions at the time, would be required prior to the decommissioning of the FSRU. Also as noted in Section 2.8, as part of the license approval, the DWPA requires each applicant to furnish a bond or demonstrate other proof that if the project is abandoned then sufficient monies would be available for either completion or demolition of the project.

Origin: E&E Website
First Name: William
Last Name: Terry
Address: 250 E. Pleasant Valley Rd. #47
City: Oxnard
State: CA
Zip Code: 93033
Phone No.: 805-488-0422
Email Address: bterry@webtv.net
Topic: Public Safety: Hazards and Risk Analysis
Comments: New information has come to light after the deadly tsunami in southeastern Asia.
 California has been working on tsunami maps.
 According to Mr. Richard Eisner who coordinates the mapping project for the California Office of Emergency Services, some coastal areas face a greater threat from home-grown tsunamis caused by earthquakes or landslides, for which there would be little or no warning. It takes a sizable earthquake, at least a 6.5, to cause a tsunami, and the type of faults that lie along California's coast aren't conducive to making waves. But smaller quakes can trigger landslides in areas such as Monterey Bay and the Santa Barbara Channel that could cause tsunamis that would hit the local coast without a warning other than the earthquake.
 What is THE answer?
 There was a workshop on the Prediction of Underwater Landslide and Slump Occurrence and Tsunami Hazards off of Southern California in March 10-11, 2000 at the University of Southern California Los Angeles, California.
 More information may be obtained at this web site
http://rccg03.usc.edu/la2000/Main_Page.htm.
 To learn more about the Santa Barbara Channel and Islands before you allow it to be destroyed. View this web site,
http://www.mbari.org/news/news_releases/2004/agu2004.html
 Please reopen public comments when BHP respond to your requests.

 Thank You

G547-1

Section 4.11.1.8 and Impact GEO-6 in Section 4.11.4 discuss this topic.

G547-1

Origin: E&E Website
Date: 12/18/2004
First Name: Ross
Last Name: Thain
Address: 5527 Bromely Dr
City: Oak Park
State: CA
Zip Code: 91377
Topic: Environmental Justice
Comments: The Natural Gas we are talking about is in abundance elsewhere and being wasted. Why not liquefy it and bring it over? It's been done before. California needs this Natural Gas and so does the rest of America. Let's get on with it!

G313-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website
Date: 12/18/2004
First Name: Donny
Last Name: Thompson
Address: 717 Hudspeth St
City: Simi Valley
State: CA
Zip Code: 93065
Topic: Energy and Minerals
Comments: California's Natural Gas demand is high and getting higher. The residence of California have been looking for was to get reasonable coasts on energy. I believe the proposed project is just what we have been looking for. The small inconveniences do not out way the good that will come of this project when completed.
Thank you for listening

G175-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website
Date: 12/20/2004
First Name: Aaron
Last Name: Tice
Address: 1043 Horn Lane
City: Eugene
State: OR
Zip Code: 97404
Topic: Energy and Minerals

Comments: I am excited to hear about the proposed LNG facility in Southern California. Although I am not a California resident, I support this project because it will bring jobs and money to the economy, it is safe and aesthetically neutral, it will bring much needed gas to Southern California, and it will help reduce some of the pressure we have here in Oregon. We need to start supplementing our reserves nationally so that we do not create another across border dependency on natural gas like we have with oil. It is important to conserve so we can meet the demands of a country that is becoming more advanced and environmentally clean every year.

Please approve this project, we need it!

G384-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website
Date: 12/20/2004
First Name: Andrew
Last Name: Tonis
Address: 2220 Kausen Dr.
City: Elk Grove
State: CA
Zip Code: 95758
Topic: Biological Resources - Marine
Comments: BHPB will be required to comply with the agencies' recommended measures which taken together mitigate many of the environmental impacts discussed in the EIR/EIS. Environmental impacts identified in the EIR can be mitigated to less than significant levels. The company is using proven technologies to minimize the project's environmental impact, while at the same time, using a state-of-the-art facility to meet California's growing energy needs. Most area associated with the construction phase. Cabrillo Port can and will be built in a safe and environmentally friendly manner.

G336-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website
Date: 12/17/2004
First Name: Franco
Last Name: Torres
Address: 310 La Cresta Heights Rd.
City: El Cajon
State: CA
Topic: Aesthetics
Comments: This project is as well thought out as anything I have seen. A temporary structure located far out to sea. Colors that help it blend into its environment. Limiting the number of trips by boats to the project site. Numerous environmental assessments. Noise is not a factor. Allowing for community input. Millions of tax dollars for the local economy. Sounds like a no-brainer to me.

G147-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Kusano, Ken LT

From: Eileen Tracy [eileenareena@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 23, 2004 7:51 PM
To: Kusano, Ken LT
Subject: Docket No. USCB 2004-26877

From: Eileen Tracy
 1415 Persimmon Ave.
 Oxnard, Ca. 93033

USCB-2004-16877-742

To: Lt. Ken Kusano (G-MSO-5)
 US Coast Guard
 2100 Second St. S.S.
 Washington, D.C. 20593

Date: 11/23/2004

I am writing to ask you to decline Billiton's application for LNG Platforms, known as Cabrillo. The EIS/EIR provided is in direct opposition to an earlier study performed in 1977/78. Other conclusions reached in Billiton's application appear unsubstantiated. This is an experimental station and I'd like you to consider an outside auditor review the application for accuracy.

There are probably 200,000+ people here in the Oxnard Plain at any time. We have no more than five (5) or six (6) evacuation routes. Most of these roads are two lane country roads and in any disaster, it would not be possible to evacuate all 200,000+ people. I heard a retired Admiral from the Department of Homeland Security this week-end. He indicated that the department has to institute additional security precautions for the LNG installation at Boston Harbor. This alone would indicate that there are security considerations and they are not addressed in the EIS/EIR.

G520-1

G520-2

You may be aware that the Long Island Lighting Company (LILCO) built a state-of-the-art nuclear power facility on that island, which was never placed in service. The reason was the failure of evacuation routes for residents of Long Island. I believe that we who reside on the Oxnard Plain have a similar situation. So I would discourage any experimental and dangerous facility from being installed here.

Additionally, running the pipeline so near to residences increases our vulnerability. I will not bore you with a laundry list of all the other reason. But I urge you to decline the application on behalf of the Coast Guard.

G520-3

Sincerely,
 Eileen Tracy

Do You Yahoo!?

Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

11/24/2004

G520-1

Section 4.2.7.6 and the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C1) contain information on public safety impacts from various incidents at the FSRU. The analysis indicates that the maximum impact distance of an accident would involve a vapor cloud dispersion extending 6.3 nautical miles (7.3 miles) from the FSRU. The FSRU would be located approximately 12.01 nautical miles (13.83 miles) offshore; therefore, consequences of an accident involving LNG transport by carrier and storage on the FSRU would extend no closer than 5.7 nautical miles (6.5 miles) from the shoreline. Figure ES-1 depicts the consequence distances surrounding the FSRU location for worst credible events.

G520-2

Section 4.2 discusses the security topic and onshore emergency response is addressed in Section 4.16.1.2 under "Emergency Planning and Response Capabilities."

G520-3

Section 4.2.8 contains information on safety requirements for pipelines. Section 4.13.1 discusses the proximity of the proposed pipeline routes to residences and schools.

Origin: E&E Website
 Date: 12/20/2004
 First Name: Nora
 Last Name: Traut
 Email: notraut@hotmail.com
 Address:
 Topic: Public Safety: Hazards and Risk Analysis

G340

Comments: My name is Nora McKinley-Traut and I am a property owner in Ventura County and I feel strongly that the Draft EIS/EIR for the Cabrillo LNG Deepwater Port is grossly inadequate in its analysis of the impacts on public safety concerning the proposed Center Road Pipeline. As proposed this pipeline will be 14.3 miles long and will traverse the Oxnard Plain. It will have a diameter of 36", a maximum allowable operating pressure of 1100 psi, and will be capable of transporting 800,000 mcf of natural gas per day, or an amount equal to approximately 12% of California's daily consumption. According to the Draft EIS/EIR, SoCalGas will own and operate this pipeline. From information published by the State of California Division of Oil and Gas and Geothermal resources it is apparent that the only areas in the State where SoCalGas operates high-pressure natural gas transmission lines that are of a large diameter comparable to the proposed Center Road Pipeline are in relatively remote areas of Riverside and San Bernardino counties. Such pipelines are in remote and unpopulated areas for a reason: they are inherently dangerous. Therefore, I ask, why do we want to approve such a potentially dangerous pipeline for construction across a high-use area such as the Oxnard Plain? As an example of the associated dangers, I cite the case where an El Paso Natural Gas transmission line, of a comparable size, exploded in southeast New Mexico in August of 2000, killing 12 members of an extended family that were on a camping trip. The resultant fireball was visible for 30 miles. Again, it is my opinion that the Draft EIS/EIR is grossly inadequate when assessing the public safety, especially concerning the dangers of a pipeline rupture in a high-use area such as the Oxnard Plain.

G340-1

G340-1

The proposed Project has changed. See Section 2.1.1 for revised routing of the Center Road Pipeline.

Section 4.2.8.1 discusses natural gas properties and hazards. High-pressure natural gas transmission and lower pressure distribution pipelines are currently routed through or near residential areas in many communities. Similar natural gas transmission pipelines currently exist in Oxnard and Ventura County, along with many other communities in Southern California. Table 4.2-19 identifies High Consequence Areas (HCAs) along Project pipeline routes.

The El Paso Natural Gas pipeline accident in 2000 near Carlsbad, New Mexico, was one of several that prompted the DOT PHMSA Office of Pipeline Safety to promulgate additional safety requirements for pipelines routed near more densely populated areas (see 49 CFR 192, Subpart O). These requirements are applicable to many locations along the proposed and alternative pipeline routes for the proposed Project.

Section 4.2.8 discusses public safety and natural gas pipelines. Section 4.2.8.2 and Appendix C3-3 identify Federal and State safety requirements for natural gas pipelines. Impact PS-4 in Section 4.2.8.4 under PS-4 discusses the more stringent guidelines for natural gas transmission lines located near sensitive sites (e.g., schools, nursing homes, hospitals).

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website
Date: 12/20/2004
First Name: Nora
Last Name: Traut
Email: notraut@hotmail.com
Address:
Topic: Socioeconomics
Comments:

My name is Nora McKinley-Traut and I am a property owner in Ventura County and I feel strongly that the Draft EIS/EIR for the Cabrillo LNG Deepwater Port inadequately addresses the impact of the proposed Center Road Pipeline on property values. Section 4.16.1.7 states that "the presence of the pipeline would not affect an objective review" of an appraisal, and that the "subjective factors that are taken into account by potential buyers differ to a degree that it is not possible to assess in this document." I believe that a conclusion can be made. The presence of a dangerous high-volume high-pressure natural gas pipeline beneath or adjacent to private property would result in a significant decrease in the value of the impacted property, especially if that property is within the "Potential Impact Radius" other wise referred to as the "Blast Zone," which for the Center Road Pipeline is 824 feet on either side of the pipeline. This radius is approximately the radius surrounding the August 2000 explosion of an El Paso Natural Gas Pipeline, which is of comparable size to the proposed Center Road Pipeline. That blast killed 12 members of a family on a camping trip.

G401-1**G401-2**

G401-1

Section 4.16.1.2 contains updated information on property values.

G401-2

Section 4.2.8.4 discusses pipeline impacts and mitigation for potential pipeline accidents.

The El Paso Natural Gas pipeline accident in 2000 near Carlsbad, New Mexico, was one of several that prompted the DOT PHMSA Office of Pipeline Safety to promulgate additional safety requirements for pipelines routed near more densely populated areas (see 49 CFR 192, Subpart O). These requirements are applicable to many locations along the proposed and alternative pipeline routes for the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website

Date: 12/20/2004

First Name: Nora

Last Name: Traut

Topic: Public Safety: Hazards and Risk Analysis

Comments: My name is Nora McKinley-Traut and I am a property owner in Ventura County and I feel strongly that the Draft EIS/EIR for the Cabrillo LNG Deepwater Port is grossly inadequate in its analysis of the impacts on public safety concerning the proposed Center Road Pipeline and I believe that the applicant has stretched the limits of the Franchise Agreement afforded to SoCalGas by the City of Oxnard and Ventura County. Section 1.6 of the Document states that "these Franchise Agreements grant the right, privilege, and franchise for SoCalGas to lay and use pipelines and appurtenances for transmitting and distributing natural gas for any and all purposes under, along, across, or upon public streets and other rights-of-way." I believe that it is the intent of the Franchise Agreement to provide SoCal gas the ability to service customers, especially in the immediate area, and that it was not the intent of the Franchise Agreement to lay high-volume high-pressure gas transmission lines, lines which are typically only located in remote areas, along our county roads and city streets. Such pipelines are extremely dangerous. I cite the case where an El Paso Natural Gas transmission line, of a comparable size, exploded in southeast New Mexico in August of 2000, killing 12 members of an extended family that were on a camping trip. The resultant fireball was visible for 30 miles. Again, it is my opinion that the Draft EIS/EIR is inaccurate in its implication that SoCalGas has the right by Franchise Agreement to lay dangerous high-pressure high-volume natural gas transmission lines beneath our city streets and county roads. The decision to construct such a pipeline should only be allowed after a complete review by the appropriate local government agencies and after obtaining a conditional use permit specific to the Center Road Pipeline.

G403

G403-1

G403-1

Section 4.13.2.1 discusses regulations, plans, and policies, including franchise agreements. High-pressure natural gas transmission and lower pressure distribution pipelines are currently routed through or near residential areas in many communities. Similar natural gas transmission pipelines currently exist in Oxnard and Ventura County, along with many other communities in Southern California. Table 4.2-19 identifies High Consequence Areas (HCAs) along Project pipeline routes.

The El Paso Natural Gas pipeline accident in 2000 near Carlsbad, New Mexico, was one of several that prompted the DOT PHMSA Office of Pipeline Safety to promulgate additional safety requirements for pipelines routed near more densely populated areas (see 49 CFR 192, Subpart O). These requirements are applicable to many locations along the proposed and alternative pipeline routes for the proposed Project.

Section 4.2.8 discusses public safety and natural gas pipelines. Section 4.2.8.2 and Appendix C3-3 identify Federal and State safety requirements for natural gas pipelines. Impact PS-4 in Section 4.2.8.4 under PS-4 discusses the more stringent guidelines for natural gas transmission lines located near sensitive sites (e.g., schools, nursing homes, hospitals).

Origin: E&E Website
Date: 12/16/2004
First Name: Hilary
Last Name: Troutman
Address: 2266 Grand Avenue #10
City: San Diego
State: CA
Zip Code: 92109
Topic: Alternatives
Comments: When BHP officials proposed laying pipeline through the City of Oxnard—which has the largest minority population in Ventura County—residents suggested they find another route. They listened and they did—and the proposed pipeline stays as far away from residential neighborhoods, rich or poor, as possible. In the one case where their pipeline comes near homes, they are going to great lengths to prevent and prepare for pipeline accidents along the new route. They should be commended for listening to the community

Thanks for registering my support for this project

G045-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

Origin: E&E Website
Date: 12/20/2004
First Name: Marcy
Last Name: Truax
Address: 19570 Feather Falls Place
City: Cottonwood
State: CA
Zip Code: 96022
Topic: Other/General Comment
Comments: The Cabrillo Port Project is an environmentally responsible energy resource project that's extremely important to our state. I urge anyone reviewing the EIS/EIR to focus on the facts presented in the document and not the rumors that seem to run ramped during comment periods such as these. Based on the facts I uderstand that you won't be able to see the structure from the shore, that's it's not going to interfere with recreational activities, that midigation measures on in place and that it will boost our struggling economy in more ways than one.

G333-1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.